



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/751,930	12/29/2000	Hong Wang	884.366US1	7985	
21186 7	1186 7590 03/04/2004		EXAMI	EXAMINER	
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.			DAS, CHAMELI		
P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2122		
			DATE MAILED: 03/04/2004	10	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

/ ·			PRQ
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/751,930	WANG ET AL.	
·	Examiner	Art Unit	
	C.DAS	2122	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence addi	ress
THE REPLY FILED 23 February 2004 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this application and a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper rep ich places the applic	oly to a cation in
PERIOD FOR RI	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	•		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The datave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exter 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortene (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	nan SIX MONTHS from the mailing date on FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE ate on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 insign and the corresponding amount of the distatutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. S 136(a) and the appropriate e fee. The appropriate ext the final Office action; or	e extension fee ension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	•		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	pecause:		
(a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or search ((see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	terially reducing or s	implifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ns.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje	ction(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed	d amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: _		sidered but does NC	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	re newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	· / /	· —–	and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-31</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).		
10. Other:			

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)
. 09/751,930

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The argument is not persuasive. Adding limitation regarding "architectural state vectors are representative of instances of processor instruction" in claim 1, "architectural states of a processor-based on execution of an executable program" in cliam 23 and a new claim 31, change scope of the claims which would require further search and/or consideration.

Chul' C- Du CHAMELI C. DAS PRIMARY EXAMINER 3/3/04